

University of Groningen

PĀRVATĪ'S SVAYAMVARA (Studies in the Skandapurāṇa I)

Bakker, Hans

Published in:
Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
1996

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Bakker, H. (1996). PĀRVATĪ'S SVAYAMVARA (Studies in the Skandapurāṇa I). *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 40, 5 - 43.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.



AUSTRIAN
ACADEMY
OF SCIENCES
PRESS

PĀRVATĪ'S SVAYAMVARA (Studies in the Skandapurāṇa I)

Author(s): Hans Bakker

Source: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens / Vienna Journal of South Asian Studies*, Vol. 40 (1996), pp. 5-43

Published by: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24007767>

Accessed: 18-02-2019 10:53 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Austrian Academy of Sciences Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens / Vienna Journal of South Asian Studies*

PĀRVATĪ'S SVAYAMVARA
(Studies in the Skandapurāṇa I)

*By Hans Bakker, Groningen**

As has been reported in various international meetings and in the Indo-Iranian Journal (ADRIAENSEN 1994), a team at the University of Groningen (consisting of R. Adriaensen, H. Isaacson and the present author) is currently working on the critical edition of the oldest extant text that calls itself Skandapurāṇa. Apart from the passage discussed below there seem to be few textual links between the vulgate Skandapurāṇa and the text we are presently editing. The oldest document on which this edition is based is a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript dating from AD 810 (our siglum S₁)¹. It contains a Skandapurāṇa (further referred to as SP) that does not yet consist of *khaṇḍas*. Of this text three recensions are known. The oldest recension is the one found in three (incomplete) Nepalese palm-leaf MSS (our sigla S₁, S₂, S₃, jointly S)². A later recension is found in a MS that in its colophon calls itself the Revākhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa (our siglum R), but that is entirely different from the printed Revākhaṇḍa³. The third and probably latest recension is found in MSS that in their colophons style themselves as the Ambikākhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa. Of these we have collected four manuscripts (our sigla A₁, A₂, A₃ and A₄, jointly A)⁴. Our edition aims at reconstructing the S recension as far as possi-

* For assistance and comments in the preparation of this article I am deeply indebted to my Groningen colleagues and team-mates R. Adriaensen and H. Isaacson. I thank Prof. Dr. H. W. Bodewitz for going through a draft of this article and making valuable suggestions.

¹ For this MS see ŚĀSTRĪ 1905: lii (reprinted with a concordance in GRÜNENDAHL 1989), GAMBIER-PARRY 1930: 22–25, and Bṛhatsūcīpatram 278 (MS No. *dvi*. 229). The MS has been microfilmed by the Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP): Reel No. B11/4. We are grateful to Prof. A. Wezler who presented us with a colour film of this MS.

² S₂: Bṛhatsūcīpatram 278 (No. *pra*. 831) = NGMPP-Reel No. B12/3; S₃: Bṛhatsūcīpatram 292 (No. *ca*. 2260) = NGMPP-Reel No. B12/2.

³ Asiatic Society in Calcutta MS 3656; see ŚĀSTRĪ 1928: No. 3909.

⁴ A₁: Asiatic Society of Bengal (Calcutta) MS 4554 (= ŚĀSTRĪ 1928: No. 3922); A₂: India Office Library (London) MS 662–663; A₃: Asiatic Society of Bengal (Calcutta) MS 972 (= ŚĀSTRĪ 1928: No. 3921); A₄: Library of the Sanskrit College (Varanasi) MS 14311.

ble, while the variants of the R and A recensions will be presented each in a separate critical apparatus. The *editio princeps* of the SP was prepared by KṚṢṢṆA PRASĀDA BHATṬARĀI and appeared in Kathmandu in 1988 (our siglum E). For further details concerning the mentioned MSS and editions the reader is referred to our publication in IJ 37.

The aim of the present study is to illustrate the value of our text for the investigation of Sanskrit literature and the mythology of Hinduism by discussing a text passage in *adhyāya* 13. This chapter is concerned with the wedding of Śiva and Pārvatī. Four more texts appear to be relevant to this topic; they are discussed below and, together with the passage in SP 13, presented at the end of this article. In the four critical apparatuses I have only given those variant readings that may be significant for the comparison of the texts.

The myth of the wedding of Śiva and Pārvatī is well known to Indologists from many Sanskrit texts as well as from numerous works of art⁵. It is all the more surprising that the version of this myth that occurs in the printed texts of the Brahmapurāṇa (abbreviated as BP; in the critical apparatus siglum B^{pur}), the Liṅgapurāṇa (abbreviated as LP) and the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa (abbreviated as MKh; in the critical apparatus siglum M^{kh}) of the vulgate SP, in which Pārvatī is allowed to choose her husband in a *svayamvara*, has attracted little attention of researchers of Puranic literature and Śaiva mythology; at least we have neither found a reference to it in the secondary literature which we have consulted directly, nor in the indices of the unsurpassed Tübingen 'Epic and Purāṇic Bibliography' (STIETENCROON 1992). The myth of Pārvatī's *svayamvara* is, however, discussed by some historians of Indian art in order to explain images of a (lying) woman with child⁶. It is this *svayamvara* version of the holy wedding that is found in *adhyāya* 13 of the SP. In addition to the four texts mentioned, a cryptic passage in the Droṇaparvan of the Mahābhārata (MBh) appears also to be of relevance, although it does not at first sight deal with Pārvatī's 'self-choice'.

⁵ For an elaborate survey the reader may be referred to the MA thesis of Ms. Martina Stoye (Freie Universität Berlin): 'Die textlichen Grundlagen zu Darstellungen der Hochzeit von Śiva und Pārvatī in der indischen Kunst', which is as yet, however, unpublished. I am grateful to Ms. Stoye for sending me her thesis and to Professor Adalbert Gail who drew my attention to this work.

⁶ My attention was drawn to this by the (unpublished) MA thesis of Ms. Britta Zehmke (Freie Universität Berlin), who was so kind as to send me her work: 'Die liegende Frau mit Kind in der indischen Steinplastik'. B. Zehmke refers to the work of BHATTASALI 1929, SANYAL 1935, AGRAWALA 1964 and JOSHI 1989. These publications were not available to me. Zehmke's investigation, however, makes it clear that the motif of the 'lying woman with child' can hardly have anything to do with Pārvatī's *svayamvara*.

We may start our investigation by having a closer look at this chapter (173) of the Dronaparvan. After the death of Droṇa and the shattering of the Kauravas, Arjuna asks Vyāsa who was the man with the lance who marched in front of him and caused such havoc on the battlefield. Vyāsa answers that Arjuna had seen Śaṃkara; Vyāsa reveals Śiva's nature in a famous eulogy, in which, among other things, reference is made to his retaliation against the gods when he is not allowed his share in the sacrifice (MBh 7.173.37–51). Then Vyāsa broaches another subject. He tells how the gods asked Śiva to break the power of the three cities of the *asuras* and how Śiva accomplished this by one three-pronged arrow when an auspicious (astronomical) conjunction of the three heavenly cities had occurred (ib. 52–58). The next *śloka* makes a very harsh transition. Apparently without any connection with the fore-going the text proceeds (59):

'After herself placing the little child with five tufts of hair on her lap, Umā, as she wished to know (who he was), asked the gods "who is this?"' (*bālam anīkagataṃ kṛtvā svayaṃ pañcaśikhaṃ punaḥ | umā jī-jñāsamānā vai ko 'yam ity abravīt surān ||*)⁷.

This verse is directly followed by another one, not less bewildering in its abruptness (60): 'The lord immobilized the arm of the infuriated Śakra that held the *vajra*; this bountiful god, lord and ruler of the entire universe' (*bāhuṃ savajraṃ śakrasya kruddhasyāstambhayat prabhuh | sa eṣa bhagavān devaḥ sarvalokeśvaraḥ prabhuh ||*).

Two themes are juxtaposed here which, on first sight, seem to have very little to do with one another: (1) Śiva's transformation into a little child and (2) his immobilisation of Indra who, it would seem, leads the gods in an act of aggression. The origin of both themes can be traced back to the Brāhmaṇa literature and a short survey of their evolution may help to clarify the text.

Discussing the function of the *brahmān* priest, the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa teaches (6.8.8–6.9.4):

'Then, when the gods thereupon performed the sacrifice, they put the fore-portion (*prāśitra*) aside for Savitr; it cleft his hands. They restored to him two golden (hands). Therefore he is celebrated as "the one with golden hands". They put it aside for Bhaga; it gouged out his eyes. Therefore they say "Bhaga is blind". They put it aside for Pūṣan; it knocked out his teeth. Therefore they say "Pūṣan is without teeth, gruel is his share". These gods said, "Indra is the most powerful, the strongest of the gods; put it aside for him". They put it aside for him.

⁷ The text of the critical edition is probably corrupt here. Below (p. 14f.) I will discuss another reading. The oddity of the passage was noted by SCHEUER 1982: 289f.

He appeased it with (his) holy power (*brahman*). Therefore one says, “the *brahman* is Indra”.⁸

The same theme is found in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa with some significant changes. Here ‘the god who rules the animals’ (*yò 'yám deváh paśúnām īšte* [ŚB 1.7.4.3]), i. e. Rudra, is asked by the gods to pierce Prajāpati, who is the sacrifice, because he had abused his daughter⁹. Rudra pierces him with the lance (*śalyá*). When the lance is torn out again, the gods offer that portion of Prajāpati, i. e. of the sacrifice, that has come out with the lance – that is the fore-portion of the sacrifice (*prāśitrá*), intended for the *brahmán* priest – to Bhaga etc.:

‘Bhaga looked at it; it burnt his eyes. And so indeed it happened. Therefore they say “Bhaga is blind”. They said, “it has not yet become appeased here, put it aside for Pūṣan”. They put it aside for Pūṣan. Pūṣan ate from it; it knocked out his teeth. And so indeed it happened. Therefore they say, “Pūṣan is without teeth”. Therefore they prepare the rice pudding (*carú*) that they make for Pūṣan from ground rice, just as for a person without teeth.’¹⁰

Brhaspati next passes it on to Savitr who appeases it: ‘What is the fore-portion (*prāśitrá*), that is originally this. When he cuts off the fore-portion, he metes out exactly that part of the sacrifice that has been pierced, that belongs to Rudra’¹¹.

Thus Rudra partly takes over Indra’s position as the god to whom this dangerous first portion of the sacrificial offering belongs; unlike Indra, however, he does not ‘appease’ it (this function is taken over by Savitr), but, on the contrary, he is seen as the cause of the mutilation of the sacrifice and consequently of the gods.

⁸ *atha yatra ha tad devā yajñam atanvata* | 8 | *tat savitre prāśitram parijah-ruḥ* | 9 | *tasya pānī praciccheda* | 10 | *tasmai hiraṇmayau pratidadhū* | 11 | *tasmād dhiranyapānir iti stutaḥ* | 12 | *tad bhagāya parijahruḥ* | 13 | *tasyāksiṇī nirjaghāna* | 14 | *tasmād āhur andho bhaga iti* | 15 | *tat pūṣṇe parijahruḥ* | 16 | *tasya dantān parovāpa* | 17 | *tasmād āhur adantakaḥ pūṣā karambhabhāga iti* | 18 | *te devā ūcuḥ* | 19 | *indro vai devānām ojiṣṭho baliṣṭhas tasmā etat parihara-teti* | 1 | *tat tasmai parijahruḥ* | 2 | *tat sa brahmaṇā śamayām cakāra* | 3 | *tasmād āhendro brahmeti* | 4 |.

⁹ Rudra himself is the issue of this abuse, see KB 6.1 (below p. 10). He avenges the incest by piercing his begetter, Prajāpati, i. e. the sacrifice (DEPERT 1977: 267f.).

¹⁰ *tād bhāgo 'vekṣām cakre tasyāksiṇī nīradadāha tāthēn nūnām tād āsa tasmād āhur andhó bhāga iti* | 6 | *té hocuḥ* | *nò nv evātrāśamat pūṣṇā enat páriharatēti tát pūṣṇē paryājahrus tát pūṣā prāśa tasya dató nirjaghāna tāthēn nūnām tād āsa tasmād āhur adántakaḥ pūṣēti tasmād yám pūṣṇē carūm kurvānti prāpiṣṭānām evā kurvanti yāthādántakāyaivām* (ŚB 1.7.4.6–7). Cf. TS 2.6.8 and GB 2.1.2. See KRAMRISCH 1961: 119f.

¹¹ *tād etān nidānena yāt prāśitrām* | 8 | *sā yāt prāśitrām avadyāti* | *yād evātrāviddham yajñāsya yād rudriyam tād evātān nīrmimīte* (ŚB 1.7.4.8–9).

The theme returns in the Sautikaparvan 18 of the Mahābhārata, where it is connected with Śiva's exclusion from the sacrifice in general.¹² When the gods have divided among themselves their share (*bhāga*) in the sacrifice, Rudra seizes his bow, and runs towards them. Cosmic phenomena come to a halt. Sacrifice (*yajña*) is shot in the heart while fleeing to heaven in the form of an antelope (*mṛga*)¹³. The gods are baffled.

'The infuriated Tryambaka cut off (*vyasālayat*) the arms of Savitr, (and knocked out) the eyes of Bhaga and the teeth of Pūṣan with the point of his bow (*dhanuṣkoṭi*). Then the gods and *aṅgas* of the sacrifice ran away all together; some rolled about on that very spot and became as if they breathed their last. But after he had put that entire (assembly) to the rout, Śitikaṇṭha laughed, arrested the point of the bow and halted the gods. Thereupon the cry (*vāc*) uttered by the immortals snapped the string of his bow and, due to the shock, O king, the bow, its string broken, quivered. Thereupon the gods along with sacrifice approached the foremost of the gods, who was without bow (now), and took refuge; and the lord showed compassion.'¹⁴

Chapter 32 of the SP, followed by i. a., the Līṅga- and Śivapurāṇas, applies the theme to the description of Śiva's exclusion from Dakṣa's sacrifice. Here Indra and Viṣṇu are added to the group of explicitly mentioned gods that fall victim to the anger of Śiva, in this case represented by his factotum Haribhadra. The arms raising their weapons are immobilized (*stambhana*), just as the other inhabitants of heaven are said to be transfixed.

'And Haribhadra, inflamed and without dismay, immobilized Śakra's hand when he raised (it); and likewise (he immobilized the hands) of the other gods. (And) before (their) eyes he, with anger on his face, knocked out Bhaga's eyes and Pūṣan's teeth, striking with the point of (his) bow. And without dismay he immobilized that dreadful discus of Viṣṇu, which shone like the apocalyptic sun, and it, (remaining) in his hand, did not move (forth).'¹⁵

So much for Śiva's mutilation of the gods.

The origin of the other theme, viz. Śiva's transformation into a little child, can also be traced back to the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, in

¹² Cf. TS 2.6.8.3: *devā vai yajñād rudrām antārāyant sā yajñām avidhyat tām devā abhi sāmagacchanta kálpatām na idám iti*, and ŚB 1.6.1.1–8.

¹³ Cf. AB 3.33.5; see also MBh 12.274.34–35, where Dakṣa's sacrifice, after having been destroyed, assumes the form of an antelope and is pursued by Śiva into heaven.

¹⁴ MBh 10.18.16–20.

¹⁵ Bh 32.47–49; cf. LP 1.100.15–17, 28–30 and ŚiP, Rudrasaṃhitā 2.37.34–36, 54f.

which Prajāpati begets a (grand)son through his four sons and daughter Uṣas (KB 6.1–3). This infant (?), ‘of a thousand eyes, of a thousand feet, with a thousand fitted (arrows on his bow)’¹⁶, asks his (grand)father to bestow upon him eight names.¹⁷ A new version of this myth is found in the Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa¹⁸, which tells that at the dawn of creation, in the first *kalpa*, Mahādeva Rudra engendered a son in his own likeness (*ātmanas tulyaṃ sutam*). This little ‘blue-red’ boy (*kumāro nīlalahitaḥ*) appeared in the lap of Brahmā and cried (*ruroda*) terribly (*ghoram*). He asked Brahmā to give him a name, and Brahmā names him Rudra. The child kept crying until altogether eight names – the same as given to Prajāpati’s son in the KB and ŚB – were given to him, the final one being Mahādeva. Thereupon the ‘blue-red’ boy requested Brahmā to bestow a domain (*sthāna*) or body (*tanu*) to each name, which resulted in the following combinations: Rudra obtained the sun, Bhava the waters, Śarva earth, Īśāna wind, Paśupati fire, Bhīma *ākāśa*, Ugra the initiated brahmin, and Mahādeva the moon. In this way the divine, primordial child in Brahmā’s lap was made to personify Śiva’s cosmic dimension, his eight embodiments (*aṣṭamūrti*), encompassing the entire phenomenal universe.

When we return to the two verses in the Droṇaparvan, we may observe that it is probably this primordial, cosmic child that sits in Umā’s lap (MBh 7.173.59); his five tufts of hair (*pañcaśikha*) may symbolize his embodiment of the five elements that build the material world. This being so, one may rightly ask what, if any, is the function of the appear-

¹⁶ *tata udatiṣṭhat sahasrākṣaḥ sahasrapāt* |13| *sahasreṇa pratihitābhiḥ* |14| (KB 6.1.13–14). Udaya comments: *sahasreṇa sahasrasamkhyābhir dhanuṣi pratihitābhiḥ samhitābhir iṣubhir upalakṣitah* |.

¹⁷ This incestuous son of Prajāpati is ‘this great god possessed of eight names, who is composed of eight folds’ (*sa eṣo ’ṣṭanāmā* |49| *aṣṭadhā vihitō mahān devaḥ* |50| [KB 6.3.49–50]), i. e. Mahādeva/Rudra, whose eight forms (*aṣṭamūrti*) are described in KB 6.2–3 (cf. ŚB 6.1.3.8–18). Apparently, the 6th *adhyāya* of the KB does not make a connection between this myth of the birth of Rudra (6.1–3) and the second section (6.4–11) dealing mainly with the function of the *brahmān* priest, in which context the myth of the sacrifice of the gods and their injury by the *prāśitra* is described (see above p. 7f.). The underlying connection, however, becomes clear when the ŚB version is taken into consideration. It is Rudra, the son of Prajāpati, i. e. the sacrifice, who procures (and i s) the first issue of the sacrifice, the ‘fore-portion’, or, in the words of the Brāhmaṇa, ‘[the portion] that belongs to Rudra’ (*rudriya* [ŚB 1.7.4.9]). The underlying identity seems to be that Rudra, son of Prajāpati’s seed, is the first issue (*prāśitra*) of Prajāpati’s (self-)sacrifice. If we keep this identity in mind the relevance of the statement that introduces the concluding part of *adhyāya* 6 of the KB becomes clear (6.10.7–8): ‘Prajāpati once emitted the sacrifice; he emitted seed by installing the sacrificial fire’ (*prajāpatir ha yajñam sasrje* |7| *so ’gnyādheyenaiva reto ’srjata* |8|).

¹⁸ PPL 121–127, i. e. Vāyupurāṇa 27 and Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa 1.10.

ance of the cosmic child in Pārvatī's lap at this junction of Tripura's destruction? And why do the infatuated gods, represented by Śakra, to whose rescue Śiva had just come and to whose wish, viz. the destruction of the triple city of the *asuras*, Śiva had just complied, why do these gods try immediately to kill their benefactor, from which evil they are only kept by the child's magic powers (MBh 7.173.60)? Even if we accept, as we are supposed to do, that the gods were struck by blindness (MBh 7.173.61), it is hard to see why the sight of Umā with a child on her lap immediately provoked such aggression, exactly at the moment when the world is rescued from a demonic threat. And what is she doing there anyway?¹⁹ And how is it possible that Umā herself, mother of the world, apparently does not recognize the child? Brahmā is the only one who recognizes Śiva and bows for him (MBh 7.173.62), whereupon Śiva undoes his spell (63). Evidently we are concerned with a conflation of at least three myths – Śiva's destruction of Tripura, his appearance as the cosmic child, and the gods' assault on him and their subsequent immobilisation – which, since they are all concerned with Śiva's majestic powers, were somehow, rather awkwardly, combined in the MBh text, making the latter prone to further involuntary corruption.

The relevance, alluded to earlier, of the *svayaṃvara* myth in SP 13 for the exegesis of the MBh passage at issue becomes evident when we study this myth in more detail. The events leading to the *svayaṃvara* in SP 13 are told in SP 12. In short the story is as follows:

In SP 12.1–20 Brahmā prophesies that Pārvatī (Umā) will obtain a husband of her choice when she stops practising *tapas*. Pārvatī ceases her *tapas* and resorts to the *aśoka* tree that has grown at the entrance of her dwelling. Hara (Śiva) approaches her in the form of an ugly dwarf, who announces that he wishes to marry her. Thanks to her yogic powers Pārvatī perceives that Śaṃkara has come to her and says that he should ask her father. Śiva, still in disguise, asks Himavat for the hand of his daughter, but Himavat, recognizing Rudra, becomes uneasy and foolishly, due to a curse, declares that he already intended to hold a *svayaṃvara* for his daughter. Śiva returns to Pārvatī, tells her about her father's intention and is about to take his leave, when Pārvatī assures him not to despair, since she will choose him. If he has any doubt, she will choose him right there. Pārvatī plucks a flowering branch from the *aśoka* tree and laying it on his shoulder says 'you have been chosen by me'.²⁰

¹⁹ Nīlakaṇṭha's commentary does not really help: *teṣu ca vardhamāneṣu rudro bālavad rāgadveśaśūnyo brahmavidyāparanāmnnyā umāyā vaśago bhavātīty etad atra pradarśyate* ||.

²⁰ SP 12.21–63 continues with several other things, among which another myth in which Śiva puts Pārvatī to the test. He assumes the form of a

In SP 13.1–27 Himavat, though aware of the engagement of his daughter with Devadeva, proceeds to organize the *svayamvara*, considering that, after all, it would bring him most honour if Parameśāna would be chosen in front of all the gods. The latter, headed by Indra, assemble in the house of Himavat. Pārvatī enters the arena in a *vimāna* and takes a garland of flowers to place at the feet of the man of her choice (SP 13.28). At that very moment, in order to test his bride to be (*devyā jījñāsāyā*), Śiva assumes the form of a child in her lap (SP 13.29). Due to her yogic powers she recognizes the god to whom she had pledged her word and is pleased (SP 13.30–31). When the gods, however, see the maiden of the wedding contest with a child in her lap they, understandably enough, are bewildered, fly into passion and try to attack him (SP 13.32). Śiva repels the assault by immobilizing and mutilating the offenders (SP 13.33–38). Brahmā is the only god who sees through Śiva's disguise, and he informs the other gods about their mistake (SP 13.39–50). The gods take refuge with Śiva (SP 13.51). Śiva is pleased and lifts the spell (SP 13.52). He assumes his supreme form, seen by the gods only after receiving a divine eye (SP 13.53–54), and is elected by Pārvatī as her husband (SP 13.56), after which the wedding is celebrated. The cosmic order, sealed by Śiva's and Pārvatī's holy wedlock, is confirmed.

It is clear that the SP story of Pārvatī's *svayamvara* combines the two mythological themes at issue, viz. (1) Śiva's taking the form of a little child (in Pārvatī's lap), and (2) Śiva's immobilisation/mutilation of the gods, though now applied in a situation in which revenge of the incest or exclusion from the sacrifice is no longer the direct cause of his anger. In contrast with the MBh text, however, the encompassing myth of Pārvatī's *svayamvara* unites these two themes into a new, meaningful and logical whole. Pārvatī stands the test, as one would expect, and does not need to ask who the child is; the ignorant gods, however, go astray. Not recognizing Śiva, they are embarrassed by the child's presence at the *svayamvara*. They become angry and consequently are immobilized/mutilated. When their delusion is removed by Brahmā, they have no choice but to recognize Śiva's superiority and to accept that he is Pārvatī's choice. In this way the Śaiva cosmic order proved to be superior to the ancient world represented by the Vedic gods. The latter were crippled and, to bring out the contrast – and this distinguishes the Epic and Puranic versions from those of the Brāhmaṇas – this was effected by the supreme lord in the form of a newly born child.

crocodile who has seized a child. Pārvatī liberates the child by giving her *tapas* away to the crocodile, who reveals his true nature.

The Brahmapurāṇa, Liṅgapurāṇa and Māheśvarakhaṇḍa tell basically the same myth as SP 13. In the BP the *svayaṃvara* episode forms part of the 'story of Umā and Śaṃkara' (*umāśaṃkarayoh punyām kathām* [BP 34.55]), which the BP has taken over from the SP in its entirety. The BP follows the text of the SP rather closely, showing only minor variants – often adaptations due to the fact that Brahmā has supplanted Sanatkumāra as the narrator – in addition to occasional omissions and corruptions. From the latter it is clear that the BP is the borrower, the SP the 'original'. The borrowed chapters in the BP, viz. 34.56 to 38.12 (= SP 11.1 to 15.12) fit neatly in between the preceding passage borrowed from the Sāmbapurāṇa (BP 29–33) and the succeeding passage borrowed from the Mahābhārata and Vāyupurāṇa (BP 39–40)²¹.

The situation is somewhat different in the case of the LP and MKh. These two texts show a greater distance to the SP, having numerous omissions, additions and transpositions, whereas they are marred by textual corruptions, due to which the story has become more difficult to follow, especially in the MKh. A comparison with the SP may help to restore its meaning. It ensues from a collation that the LP is closer to the SP and that the text of the MKh goes back to an original that must have been related to the text as found in the LP.

No such close correspondence is found between the MBh and SP, but there are some indications that, at the time the MBh passage at issue was composed, the myth of Pārvatī's *svayaṃvara* was not wholly unknown. It might actually have been the source whence the disaskeuast derived both themes, namely Śiva (Rudra) as a child and the injury of the gods, unified by Pārvatī's pivot role.²² These may have

²¹ See the Appendices 4 and 5 of the edition of SCHREINER and SOHNEN. Though it has been known since long "that the Brahma^o, as presently edited, is nothing more than a loose 'conglomeration of portions belonging to different periods and written by different hands'" (ROCHER 1986: 155), until now the source of the chapters 34 to 38 has not been identified. I am grateful to Mss. Zehmke and Stoye (see above p. 6n. 5f.), whose MA theses drew my attention to this BP passage. While I was preparing this article for the press, it was brought to my notice that at least fragments of the (original) Brahmapurāṇa quoted by Lakṣmīdhara are found in a manuscript in the Jammu & Kashmir Government Research Library (Srinagar, MS No. 1346), the title of which is written as *ā. pu.*, taken to mean Ādipurāṇa. On the cover of this fragment the title *mārtāṇḍamāhātmya* has been written in another hand. The fragment itself is without colophon. The text has been edited by IKARI (1994), who also gives a concordance with the corresponding passages in the Kṛtyakalpataṛu and Kṛtyaratnākara where the text is quoted as Brahmapurāṇa. The same fragment corresponds partly with the text of the Nīlamatapurāṇa.

²² The connection between (the child) Rudra and the mutilation of the gods is not completely new, since it underlies the myth of Prajāpati's (self-)

been lifted out of their context and incorporated in the eulogy of Rudra to illustrate his greatness. With the destruction of Tripura they evidently lack any intrinsic relation.

To facilitate a comparison I have presented the five text traditions in four parallel columns (see p. 24ff.). The BP version is not given a column of its own; its variant readings are given in the critical apparatus *ad* the text of SP²³. The text of MBh 7.173 actually recurs in MBh 13.145; the major variant readings of the reprise have been given in the apparatus (the sigla are those of the Critical Edition). The text of SP is basically a reconstruction of the S recension, though it should be taken into account that for the passage at issue only S₂ is available. The sequence of *ślokas* in the LP and the MKh of the Venkateśvara (and Vaṅgavāsī) Press editions has been adapted to the SP and this already yields a slight improvement of the story line.²⁴ Significant variant readings of the Vaṅgavāsī editions of the LP and MKh have been either accepted in the text or presented in the apparatus.²⁵

When we turn our attention again to MBh 7.173.59 we see in the apparatus that a part of the Southern Recension inserts before this

sacrifice and Rudra's birth (see p. 10n. 17). Though the two myths are structurally akin, the trait-d'union between both themes changes from the sacrifice, i. e. Prajāpati, in the Brāhmaṇas to Pārvaṭī in the epic and Purāṇas.

²³ If one of the variant readings of the BP text that are presented in SCHREINER and SÖHNEN's edition corresponds with SP, the other readings are ignored. Occasionally, if these variant readings resemble the SP reading, they are also given in the apparatus with siglum B^{pur}.

²⁴ Occasionally the Venkateśvara edition of the MKh gives a variant reading – *i(tarah) pā(ṭah)* – which is noted in the apparatus. The commentary of Gaṇeśa Nāṭu in the Venkateśvara edition of the LP has also been presented in the apparatus.

²⁵ One may recall Friedhelm Hardy's dictum (HARDY 1983: 592) to the effect that "any analysis solely based on *one* printed edition of a *Purāṇa* will be one-sided or even distorted". It would be better still, and generally of greater significance (as too often the printed editions appear to be related to one another), to consult the MSS of the *Purāṇa* at issue. It is obvious that here practical considerations impose a limit. I am very grateful to my colleague H. Isaacson for having taken the trouble to look at a MS of the LP in the Bodleian Library (MS Wilson 100). According to Isaacson "this MS does not look very old and has a large number of mistakes, but very strikingly it agrees in some places more closely with the SP than the printed *Līṅgapurāṇa* does". The significant variants are given in the apparatus of LP with siglum MS^{Bodl}. The variant readings of another *Līṅgapurāṇa* MS in the National Archives of Nepal (No. 6/3393) dated NS 837 (= AD 1717), available on a microfilm of the NGMPP in Berlin (Reel A 1392/6), are also presented in the apparatus with siglum MS^{Nep} (it concerns the folios 195^v to 196^v). I am grateful to Prof. A. Wezler, by whose kind offices this microfilm was placed at my disposal.

verse a significant hemistich (1460*): 'Listen to another event, O Dhanamjaya, (which happened) at Pārvatī's *svayaṃvara*' (*devyāḥ svayaṃvare vṛttam śṛṇuṣvānyad dhanamjaya* /). The insertion of this hemistich may have been prompted by the harsh transition from the Tripura battle scene to Śiva's transformation into a child. Since this hemistich is only found in the Telugu and some of the Grantha MSS, it may be secondary and not have formed part of the original MBh text, but, all the same, it could represent a reminiscence of the original context to which the myth told in the following verses might have belonged.

Another significant variant is found *ad* 59c. This reading, although the editors of the Critical Edition have relegated it to the apparatus, is supported by a substantial part of the northern and southern MSS as well as by some of the MSS at MBh 13.145.30c, and would correspond much better with the story as told in SP. According to this reading Śiva changes into a little child 'to test Umā' (*umām jijnāsamāno*, subject Śiva), corresponding to SP 29a (BP 36.28a) *devyā jijnāsayā* ('in order to test the Goddess'), which has a greater intrinsic probability than Umā openly acknowledging her ignorance: *umā jijnāsamānā*. The editors of the MBh may have been tempted into accepting this, probably corrupt version of 59c in the critical text on account of the fact that the MBh text as we have it does not explicitly state that Umā stands the test and recognizes Śiva and because Śiva as the subject of *abravīt* in 59d seems rather odd as we would expect *ko 'ham iti*. However, also the reading of 59d is far from certain. That Umā's knowledge of the child's true nature was (originally) taken as understood may be deduced not only from the fact that the gods altogether ignore her question, but also from the fact that only they manifest their ignorance in the story that follows (MBh 7.173.61).²⁶ And neither does Brahmā, who knows the truth, inform Umā; on the contrary, Umā, together with Śiva, is the object of veneration in verse 63, directly after Brahmā's discovery in verse 62. The conclusion seems inevitable that verse 59 as a whole is corrupt beyond reliable restoration and a wavy line under the entire verse in the edition would not have been superfluous. The (later) Liṅgapurāṇa and the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa have replaced the (probably) original feature of 'Umā's trial' by the traditional platitude that it is just Śiva's game (*kṛidāṛtham* [LP 1.102.28d, MKh 2.25.100d]).

Due to textual corruption MKh 101–102 has become difficult to understand, which may have led the pundits of the Veṅkaṭeśvara Press to their note given in the apparatus *ad* 100cd–101. The *tasya* in

²⁶ Significant may be also that Pārvatī takes the child on to her lap (59ab), but the reading of the entire verse 59 is uncertain.

MKh 102b and *tasyā* in LP 29d lack an obvious antecedent (SP reads *devyā*). The two *pādas* MKh 101cd make the impression of an interpolation, the connection of which with the immediate context is difficult to determine. The relevance of the word *jaya* is obscure and may point to another context, perhaps the exegetical tradition concerning the famous verse that opens the Mahābhārata and, for instance, the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa²⁷.

In SP 34–38 (BP 36.33–36ab), LP 31–39 and MKh 104–110 (missing in MBh) the theme of the mutilation of the gods is worked out, adding to the immobilized Indra other victims such as Bhaga (not in LP) and Pūṣan (not in BP), known as such already from the Brāhmaṇa literature. A very striking elaboration is presented in SP 36, which is without parallel in the MKh and significantly different in LP, whereas BP (36.36cd) has omitted the second remarkable hemistich (SP 36cd). The deluded Viṣṇu angrily shakes his head, whereupon Śiva makes his hair fall out. I have not succeeded in finding any reference to Viṣṇu's baldness in Sanskrit literature and we may have here an idiosyncrasy of the ancient Skandapurāṇa text.²⁸ That this extreme Śaivism was hard to swallow for later redactors of the text may follow not only from the adaptation in the Liṅgapurāṇa, where Viṣṇu's head is immobilized instead of made bald, and the omission of this verse or half of it in the Māheśvarakhaṇḍa and in the Brahmapurāṇa, but also from the interpolations in the R and A recensions of SP *ad* 39ab (only in R) and *ad* 50cd, in which Viṣṇu's role is mitigated when it is said, that Nārāyaṇa has known from the start that it was Śiva who fooled the gods²⁹.

Then in MBh 62, SP 39–40 (BP 36.36cd–39ab), LP 40–41 and MKh 111–112ab Brahmā sees what Śiva's game is and starts praising him. Of the five *ślokas* that follow in SP 41–45 (BP 36.39cd–44ab) and LP 42cd–47, in which Brahmā reveals Śiva's true nature and coaxes him into undoing his spell, the MKh has retained only one (112cd–113ab), while the Northern Recension of the MBh includes three different, though appropriate verses after 62, relegated to the apparatus by the editors. The effect of this is that according to the text of the Critical

²⁷ *nārāyaṇam namaskṛtya naram caiva narottamam / devīm sarasvatīm caiva tato jayam udīrayet ||*.

²⁸ The only exception is the hymn in praise of Śiva after his wedding, which is borrowed by the BP and in which obeisance is paid to Śiva as *kṛṣṇakeśāpahārīṇe*, clearly a reference to the episode under discussion, since the same verse praises him also as *pūṣṇo dantaharāya* and *bhaganetranipātāya* (SP 14.9 = BP 37.9). The SP refers again to Viṣṇu's loss of hair in Bh 32, p. 201,20f.

²⁹ This uprating of Viṣṇu's position is consistently found throughout the R and A recensions.

Edition the gods never are informed about the true nature of the child, which again makes it unlikely that, in spite of that, they suddenly are able to satisfy (*prasādayām āsur*) Umā and Rudra in verse 63.

The next passage, SP 46–47 (BP 36.44cd–45) and LP 48–49, has also been transmitted incompletely in the MKh (113cd–114). The equivalent of SP 46 and LP 48, in which Brahmā turns to the gods, has been omitted, as a result of which the text has become unintelligible as it is no longer clear who are addressed. The corruption may have had its starting point, however, in the alternative Sandhi *mūdhā stha* for *mūdhāḥ stha* (SP 13.47a), which we find in the SP manuscript S₂ and the Venkaṭeśvara edition of LP. Although Kātyāyana *ad* Pāṇini 8.3.36 allows the elision of the final *s* before a sibilant followed by a voiceless occlusive and this practice is found regularly in manuscripts³⁰, the loss of the hiatus between *mūdhā* and *stha* in handwriting (reflected in the Venkaṭeśvara edition of the LP) may have caused that the verbal second plural indicative ('you are fools') was no longer understood, which gave rise to the nominal *mūdhās tu* (A_{1/3}) and *mūdhās ca* in BP and MKh. The vocative *devatāḥ* in SP was accordingly interpreted as a nominative and the nominative plural masculine of the subject, *sarve* ('you all'), was taken as attributive to *devatāḥ* and adjusted to a nominative plural feminine, *sarvās* ('all the deities') in BP, LP and MKh. The second plural indicative *na budhyatha* ('you do not understand' [SP 47b]) corrupted to *na budhyata* (already in the A recension of SP), which we should interpret as an augmentless imperfect in order to avoid the absurd imperative 'you should not recognize'. In short, the transcriptive and intrinsic probability of the corruptions point to successive stages, of which the MKh represents the last. Thanks to the SP we are now in the position to understand what the BP, LP and MKh were supposed to convey.

SP 48–49 show the acquaintance of Brahmā (and the authors of the ancient Skandapurāṇa) with the symbolic meaning of the child as the embodiment of Śiva's cosmic dimension, which meaning is now revealed to the Vedic gods. In addition to epithets such as *kapardīmat*, *ātman*, *aja* etc., we encounter seven of the eight names of the *aṣṭamūrti*; only Bhava appears to be missing or is substituted by another name such as Śaṃkara or Devadeva (cf. SP 4.17–20). This revelation of the child's eightfold nature has become lost in the course of transmission as the omission of these two verses in BP, LP and MKh attests (cf. LP 106.23f.). The absence of the child's qualification as *pañcaśikha* in LP 28d and MKh 100d should probably be viewed in the same light. At the instance of Brahmā the still petrified gods turn their minds towards Śarva (*praṇemur manasā śarvaṃ* [SP 51, BP 36.47,

³⁰ Cf. WACKERNAGEL 1896: 342 (§287b).

LP 52]), whereas a minor textual inconsequence in the MKh permits them to bow (*pranātāḥ*) at that as well (MKh 115ab). The Māheśvara-khaṇḍa then inserts a *stotra*, in which the gods apologize for their behaviour (MKh 115cd–121ab), which does not occur in the other versions and therefore may be considered an accretion.

In MBh 63, SP 52 (BP 36.48), LP 53 and MKh 121cd–122ab the texts converge again: the satisfied Śiva restores the gods to their normal condition. With this ends the episode in the MBh, which continues with its eulogy of Rudra.

The SP, BP, LP and MKh continue their story of Umā's *svayaṃvara*. The MKh inserted 5 *ślokas* (122cd–127ab) in which the *daityas* in their turn express their ignorance. By pronouncing the *bīja huṃ* Śiva drives them back to their own city where they forget about the *svayaṃvara*, a fate that, unfortunately, did not remain restricted to that city and its inhabitants.

In the following verses the great god drops his disguise and manifests himself in his supreme body (*vapus*), which can only be seen by the gods after having received a supreme eye. It is noteworthy that according to the LP and MKh versions also the Goddess (Bhavānī) needs such an eye (LP 1.102.57b, MKh 2.25.130d), whereas in SP 13.54 (BP 36.50cd–51ab) – consistent with SP 13.30 (BP 36.29), which verse has no parallel in LP and MKh – she evidently possesses this capacity (by virtue of her yogic powers). Yet, the superiority of the Goddess over the gods is acknowledged in the LP and MKh versions as well, when in these two texts 'Brahmā and so forth' are said to bow before Śiva as well as before the Goddess (LP 1.102.58cd, MKh 2.25.134ab)³¹.

In SP 56 (BP 36.52cd–53ab), LP 61cd–62ab and MKh 134cd–135ab Devī finally chooses Śiva as her husband by placing the wreath at his feet. In the next verse(s) the gods express approval by exclaiming 'hail, hail!'. The words *saha devyā* in LP 63a (MKh 136a) could be construed with *sarve devāḥ* in 63c (MKh 136c), which would imply that the Goddess is herself honouring instead of being honoured as is the case in SP 57. Apart from the fact that the Sanskrit construction is rather cumbersome, this does not fit the situation, all the less so, since taking *saha devyā* with the subject of *namaś cakruḥ* would normally

³¹ The reading of BP 36.52a, MS^{Nep} and MKh 134a, *menire*, looks like a corruption (metathesis) of the text as found in SP and LP, whereas the reading of LP 58d seems a corruption of the reading as found in MKh 134b, possibly caused by LP's transposition of this hemistich. Our placing of this hemistich after 61ab, however, does not solve the problem (note that MS^{Nep} reads *digīśvarāḥ* to avoid the awkwardness). LP 61c has preserved the no doubt correct reading *hr̥ṣṭā* of SP 56a, while MKh reads *dṛṣṭvā* (134c), echoing the mistaken conception underlying LP and MKh, viz. that the Goddess has only just now, after receipt of a supreme eye, seen her future spouse.

entail that the Goddess is also part of the subject of *samprocyā* in LP 62c and MKh 135c, which, however, is undesirable as it is totally inappropriate. If, on the other hand, we take *saha devyā* with the object clause LP 62d and MKh 135d, this would also result in an awkward construction (*tayā* along with *saha devyā*).³² In short, we may conclude that the reformulation and elaboration of the final verses in LP and MKh is rather unfortunate and illustrates once more the value of the SP for the understanding of these two Purāṇas as printed.

Summarizing, we may say that the corruptions and elaborations in the second part of the text which is without counterpart in the MBh confirm the tentative conclusion reached above, viz. that the Māheś-varakhaṇḍa represents a later version of the myth as told in LP, whereas the wording of the latter deviates again from the text as preserved in the ancient Skandapurāṇa, without improving upon it, however, in any respect. On the contrary, the collation clearly shows that the corresponding text portions of the Liṅgapurāṇa and Māheś-varakhaṇḍa successively derived from an archetype that represented a corrupted version of SP. The Brahmapurāṇa version of the myth is an independent copy of the SP text, which does not seem to have a direct connection with the archetype from which the Liṅgapurāṇa and Māheśvarakhaṇḍa derived. Corruptions and omissions show the dependency of the Brahmapurāṇa on SP and not *vice versa*. The textual distortions that the Brahmapurāṇa has in common with the Liṅgapurāṇa and Māheśvarakhaṇḍa, notably in the passages SP 35–38 and SP 48–49, seem to point to a slightly altered version of the S recension of SP that is not, or only partly represented in our MS material.

The wording of the SP, in its turn, does not show direct dependency on the MBh, but nevertheless elucidates it considerably, since it preserved the context from which the verses in the MBh may have been borrowed. We thus have stumbled upon a layer in the process of composition of the MBh that has been transmitted incompletely – and consequently incomprehensibly – in the MS tradition of the epic. One explanation of this phenomenon could be that in the course of this MS transmission, at an early stage, for one reason or another a significant text passage had been lost and that only the Telugu and Grantha traditions preserved a vestige thereof. However, the hemistich MBh 7.1460* (*ad* 7.173.58; see above p. 15) makes the impression of being secondary, i. e. of being an explanatory interpolation. A copyist of the

³² The commentary of Gaṇeśa Nāṭu is equally ambiguous on this point, although it seems most natural to me that he construes *saha devyā* with the subject. The *daṇḍa* after *śīrobhiḥ* is misplaced anyway.

Telugu and Grantha lines of transmission may have known the myth through the Purāṇa tradition. On the other hand, the textual incongruity at issue could itself have been caused by an early infelicitous interpolation in the text of the Dronaparvan. The interpolator may have known the myth of Pārvatī's *svayaṃvara* and may have carelessly used elements of it to embellish the eulogy of Śiva, an example of what I elsewhere have called 'composition-in-transmission'. If this were the case, it probably was a very early interpolation, not only because the passage is found in all major MSS, but also in the reprise in book 13. A third possibility is that a diaskeuast who worked on the Dronaparvan composed his text by drawing upon disparate texts and that one of these texts contained the myth of Pārvatī's *svayaṃvara*. In this connection the question arises how we should conceive of the nature of this text, a question that may also be formulated as follows: how did the redactor of this part of the Dronaparvan proceed? Did he have written texts at his disposal or did he collect his material from memory, that is, was he acquainted with a corpus of orally transmitted mythology out of which corpus he selected those parts that he could use? In view of the Vedic roots of two of the themes of the *svayaṃvara* myth, it seems likely to me that the myth of Pārvatī's *svayaṃvara* circulated before it found its place in the SP, or in its garbled form in the MBh for that matter. Whether this circulation had an oral or written basis, or was actually an interplay of the two, is a question that has a direct bearing on our understanding of the process of composition of the Mahābhārata itself, a question that falls beyond the scope of the present investigation.

Bibliography and Abbreviations

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| AB | Aitareya Brāhmaṇa: Das Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. Mit Auszügen aus dem Commentare von Sāyaṇācārya und anderen Beilagen hrsg. von TH. AUFRECHT. Bonn 1879. |
| ADRIAENSEN 1994 | R. ADRIAENSEN – H. T. BAKKER – H. ISAACSON, Towards a Critical Edition of the <i>Skandapurāṇa</i> . IJ 37 (1994) 325–331. |
| AGRAWALA 1964 | URMILA AGRAWALA, Khajurāho Sculptures and their Significants. Delhi 1964. |
| Bh | Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākāṇḍaḥ, [ed.] KṚṢṆA PRASĀDA BHATṬARĀI. [Mahendra Ratnagrantha Series 2]. Kathmandu: Mahendra Saṃskṛta Viśvavidyālaya – Rānī Printing Press, 1988. |
| BHATTASALI 1929 | NALINI KANTA BHATTASALI, Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum. Dacca 1929. |

- BP Brahmapurāṇa: PETER SCHREINER – RENATE SÖHNEN, Sanskrit Indices and Text of the Brahmapurāṇa. [Purāṇa Research Publications Tübingen, Vol. 1] Wiesbaden 1987.
- Bṛhatsūcīpatram [Index of Old MSS in the National Archives, Nepal] Vol. 8: Purāṇa and Itihāsa by BĀBU KṚṢṆA ŚARMA [under the supervision of] Buddhisaṅgāra Śarman. [Purātattva Prakāśana Series 43]. Publication of the National Archives, Kathmandu s. d.
- DEPPERT 1977 JOACHIM DEPPERT, Rudras Geburt. Systematische Untersuchungen zum Inzest in der Mythologie der Brāhmaṇas. [Beiträge zur Südasienforschung, Bd. 28]. Wiesbaden 1977.
- GAMBIER-PARRY 1930 T. R. GAMBIER-PARRY, A Catalogue of Photographs of Sanskrit MSS purchased for the administrators of the Max Müller Memorial Fund. Oxford – London 1930.
- GB Gopatha Brāhmaṇa: Das Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, hrsg. von DIEUKE GAASTRA. Leiden 1919.
- GRÜNENDAHL 1989 REINHOLD GRÜNENDAHL, A Concordance of H. P. Śāstri's Catalogue of the Durbar Library and the Microfilms of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project. [Publications of the NGMPP I = Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 31]. Stuttgart 1989.
- HARDY 1983 FRIEDHELM HARDY, Viraha-Bhakti. The early history of Kṛṣṇa devotion in South India. Delhi – Oxford – New York 1983.
- IKARI 1994 YASUKE IKARI – TAKAO HAYASHI, Ādipurāṇa. In: Y. IKARI (ed.), A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir. Kyoto 1994, p. 83–136.
- JOSHI 1989 N. P. JOSHI, Brahmanical Sculptures in the State Museum, Lucknow. Part II, Vol. 1 (Śiva and Viṣṇu) & 2 (Gaṇapati, Skanda, Brahmā, Sūrya, Revanta, Grahas, Śakti-images and Minor Divinities). Lucknow 1989.
- KB Kausītaki Brāhmaṇa: Kauṣītakibrāhmaṇa [with the Vyākhyā of Udaya, hrsg. von E. R. SREEKRISHNA SARMA. Bd. 1–3. [Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 9,1–3]. Wiesbaden 1968–1976.
- KRAMRISCH 1961 STELLA KRAMRISCH, Pūṣan. JAOS 81 (1961) 104–122.
- LP Liṅgapurāṇa: (Venk. Ed.) Liṅgapurāṇa [of] Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa [with the Commentary] Śivatoṣiṇī of Gaṇeśa Nātu. Bombay: Venkaṭeśvara Press, 1857/1963 [= AD 1906]. – (Vaṅg. Ed.) Liṅgapurāṇa [of] Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa, ed. PAṆCĀNANA TARKARATNA. Calcutta: Vaṅgavāsi Press, 1297 [= AD 1890].
- MBh Mahābhārata: (Crit. Ed.) The Mahābhārata, for the first time critically ed. VISHNU S. SUKTHANKAR et al. 19 vols.

- Poona 1927–1959. – (Nīlakaṇṭha) ŚrīMahābhāratam [with the Commentary] Bhāratabhāvadīpa of Nīlakaṇṭha. 7 vols. Chitrashala Press 1929–1936.
- MKh Māheśvarakhaṇḍa: (Veṅk. Ed.) Māheśvarakhaṇḍa of the Skandapurāṇa. Vol. 1 ed. KṢEMARĀJA. Bombay 1910. – (Vaṅg. Ed.) Skandapurāṇam: Māheśvarakhaṇḍam, ed. Śrīyukta PAṆCĀNANA TARKARATNA [with a Bengali translation by] Śrī TĀRĀKĀNTA DEVAŚARMA Kāvya-tīrtha. Bombay: Vaṅgavāsī Press, 1318 [= AD 1911].
- NGMPP Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project
- PPL Purāṇapañcalakṣaṇa: WILLIBALD KIRFEL, Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa. Versuch einer Textgeschichte. Bonn 1927.
- ROCHER 1986 LUDO ROCHER, The Purāṇas. [A History of Indian Literature, Vol. II, Fasc. 3]. Wiesbaden 1986.
- SANYAL 1935 NIRADBANDHU SANYAL, The Proposed Identification of the 'Mother & Child' Images as Sadyojāta. In: Proceedings and Transactions of the Seventh All-India Oriental Conference. Baroda 1935, p. 775–779.
- ŚĀSTRĪ 1905 HARA PRASĀD ŚĀSTRĪ, A Catalogue of Palm-Leaf & Selected Paper MSS. belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal (to which has been added a Historical Introduction by C. BENDALL). Calcutta 1905.
- ŚĀSTRĪ 1928 Id., A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Vol. V: Purāṇa Manuscripts. Calcutta 1928.
- ŚB Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa: The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-Çākhā with extracts from the commentaries of Sāyaṇa, Harisvāmin and Dvivedaganga ed. ALBRECHT WEBER. Leipzig 1924 (Repr. Varanasi 1964).
- SCHEUER 1982 JACQUES SCHEUER, Śiva dans le Mahābhārata. [Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Religieuses, Vol. LXXXIV]. Paris 1982.
- ŚiP Śivapurāṇa: ŚrīŚivamahāpurāṇam, [ed.] KṢEMARĀJA. Bombay: Venkatesvara Press, Bombay 2011/1876 [= AD 1954].
- SP (The critical edition of the old) Skandapurāṇa (as currently prepared in Groningen; cf. Bh)
- STIETENCROON 1992 Epic and Purāṇic Bibliography (up to 1985) annotated and with indexes. Compiled under the chairmanship of Heinrich von Stietencron. Ed. H. VON STIETENCROON – K. P. GIETZ – A. MALINAR – A. KOLLMANN – P. SCHREINER – M. BROCKINGTON. 2 vols. [Purāṇa Research Publications Tübingen, Vol.3, Pt. I–II]. Wiesbaden 1992.
- TS Taittirīya Saṃhitā: Die Taittirīya-Saṃhitā, hrsg. von ALBRECHT WEBER. Theil 1–2. [Indische Studien XI–XII]. Leipzig 1871–1872.
- WACKERNAGEL 1896 JAKOB WACKERNAGEL, Altindische Grammatik. I. Lautlehre. Göttingen 1896.

SKANDAPURĀṆA 13.28–57 AND ITS PARALLELS

A Critical and Synoptic Edition

*

बालमङ्कगतं कृत्वा
स्वयं पञ्चशिखं पुनः ।
उमा जिज्ञासमाना वै
को ऽयमित्यब्रवीत्सुरान् ॥ 59

मालां प्रगृह्य देव्यां तु
स्थितायां देवसंसदि ।
शक्राद्यैरागतैर्देवैः
स्वयंवर उपागतैः ॥ 28
देव्या जिज्ञासया शम्भुर्
भूत्वा पञ्चशिखः शिशुः ।
उत्सङ्गतलसंसुप्तो
बभूव सहसा विभुः ॥ 29

अकस्मादथ तं देवी
शिशुं पञ्चशिखं स्थितम् ।
ज्ञात्वा योगसमाधानाज्
जहृषे प्रीतिसंयुता ॥ 30
अथ सा शुद्धसंकल्पा
काङ्क्षितप्राप्तसत्फला ।
निर्वृतेव तदा तस्थौ
कृत्वा हृदि तमेव तु ॥ 31

* T, G₂₋₄ insert: देव्याः स्वयंवरे वृत्तं
शृणुष्वान्यद्भनंजय । 59a कृत्वा] दृष्ट्वा D_{n,1}
T G₂₋₄ M₃₋₅ 59ab] तं चैवाङ्कगतं
दृष्ट्वा बालं पञ्चशिखं पुनः । MBh 13.145.30ab
59c] उमा जिज्ञासमानो वै ऽ K₃ D_{1,8} G₁
M_{1,2} and ad MBh 13.145.30c D_{1,2,4,6,8-10}
T₁, उमा जिज्ञासुमनसः G_{2,4} 59d] को
ऽयमित्यब्रुवन्सुराः G₂, शक्रः को ऽयमथाब्रवीत्
D₄₋₉ ad MBh 13.145.30d 59d सुरान्]
स तां B₂, तदा MBh 13.145.30d (हरः D₁₀ T
G_{1,4}) After 59 N inserts: असुयतश्च शक्रस्य
वज्रेण प्रहरिष्यतः । (= MBh 13.145.31ab)

28d उपागतैः] उपागते B^{pur} 30a अथ]
एव B^{pur} 30c योगसमाधानाज्] तं समव-
ध्यानाज् B^{pur} 30d जहृषे] जगृहे
B^{pur}, प्रहृषे B^{pur*} 31b काङ्क्षितप्राप्त°]
काङ्क्षितं प्राप्य B^{pur} °सत्फला] SE, °सत्पतिम्
RB^{pur} (B^{pur*} सत्फलम्), °संकला { °कुला A₁ } A
31c निर्वृतेव] निवृत्ता च B^{pur} (B^{pur*} निवृत्त्यैव)
31d हृदि तमेव तु] सा हृदि तं विभुम् B^{pur}

Lingapurāṇa 1.102

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

चामरासक्तहस्ताभिर्
दिव्यस्त्रीभिश्च संवृता ॥ 26
मालां गृह्य जया तस्थौ
सुरदृमसमुद्भवाम् ।
विजया व्यजनं गृह्य
स्थिता देव्याः समीपगा ॥ 27
मालां प्रगृह्य देव्यां तु
स्थितायां देवसंसदि ।

चामरासक्तहस्ताभिर्
दिव्यस्त्रीभिश्च संवृता ।
मालां प्रगृह्य सा तस्थौ
सुरदृमसमुद्भवाम् ॥ 99

एवं तस्यां स्थितायां तु
स्थिते लोकत्रये तदा ।

शिशुर्भूत्वा महादेवः
क्रीडार्थं वृषभध्वजः ॥ 28
उत्सङ्गतलसंसुप्तो
बभूव भगवान्भवः । 29ab

शिशुर्भूत्वा महादेवः
क्रीडार्थं वृषभध्वजः ॥ 100
उत्सङ्गतलसंसुप्तो
बभूव भगवान्भवः ।
जयेति यत्पदं ख्यातं
तस्य सत्यार्थमीश्वरः ॥ 101

27a गृह्य जया तस्थौ] प्रगृह्य सा तस्थौ
MS^{Nep} 27cd गृह्य स्थिता] गृह्यास्थिता
MS^{Nep} Ad 28 the commentator Gaṇeśa Nātu
remarks: शिवचेष्टितं कथयति शिशुरित्यादिना ॥

100cd-101] The editor remarks: अस्य
सार्धल्लोकस्यार्थो यथार्थतस्तत्त्वतो नावगम्यते ।
101d ईश्वरः] ईश्वरम् Veñk. Ed. The
pādas 101cd are clearly an accretion.

बाहुं सवज्रं शक्रस्य
कुद्धस्यास्तम्भयत्प्रभुः ।
स एष भगवान्देवः
सर्वलोकेश्वरः प्रभुः ॥ 60

ततो दृष्ट्वा शिशुं देवा
देव्या उत्सङ्गवर्तिनम् ।
को ऽयमत्रेति संमन्त्र्य
चुकुधुर्भृशमर्दिताः ॥ 32
वज्रमाकारयत्तस्य
बाहुमुत्क्षिप्य वृत्रहा ।
स बाहुरुत्थितस्तस्य
तथैव समतिष्ठत ॥ 33
स्तम्भितः शिशुरूपेण
देवदेवेन शम्भुना ।
वज्रं क्षेप्तुं न शशाक
बाहुं चालयितुं न च ॥ 34

भगो नाम ततो देव
आदित्यः काश्यपो बली ।
उत्क्षिप्य मुशलं दीप्तं
क्षेप्तुमैच्छद्विमोहितः ।
तस्यापि भगवान्बाहुं
तथैवास्तम्भयत्तदा ॥ 35
शिरः प्रकम्पयन्विष्णुः
सक्रोधस्तमवैक्षत ।
तस्यापि शिरसो देवः
खालित्यं प्रचकार ह ॥ 36

60ab] सवज्रं स्तम्भयामास तं बाहुं परिघोपमम् ॥
MBh 13.145.31cd After 60ab N inserts
eight *ślokas* that elaborate on 61 and 62 (not in
MBh 13.145)

32d चुकुधुर्] SE, चुकुशुर् RB^{pur}, चुभुक्षु
A_{2,3}, बुक्षुभुर् A₁ अर्दिताः] E,
आर्दिताः S₂, आस्थिताः RA, °मोहिताः B^{pur}
(B^{pur}* आर्दितः) 33a आकारयत्] SE,
आधारयत् A, आराधयत् R, आहारयत् B^{pur}
33c] स्वबाहुरुन्नतस्तस्य A 34] om. R
34c न] नो E (conj. m.c.) 34d बाहुं
चालयितुं] वृत्रहा चालितुम् B^{pur} 35–36ab]
om. R 35c मुशलं] आयुधं B^{pur} 35d
क्षेप्तुमैच्छद्] छेत्तुमिच्छन् B^{pur} After 35ef
B^{pur} reads 38ef 36b] शंकरं समवैक्षत B^{pur}
36cd–38cd] om. B^{pur} 36d खालित्यं] SE,
खानित्यं A, नित्यं R (hypometrical)

Līṅgapurāṇa 1.102

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

अथ दृष्ट्वा शिशुं देवास्
तस्या उत्सङ्गवर्तिनम् ॥ 29cd
को ऽयमत्रेति संमन्त्र्य
चुक्षुभुश्च समागताः ।
वज्रमाहारयत्तस्य
बाहुमुद्यम्य वृत्रहा ॥ 30
स बाहुरुद्यमस्तस्य
तथैव समुपस्थितः ।
स्तम्भितः शिशुरूपेण
देवदेवेन लीलया ॥ 31
वज्रं क्षेप्तुं न शशाक
बाहुं चालयितुं तथा ॥ 32ab

अथ दृष्ट्वा शिशुं देवास्
तस्य उत्सङ्गवर्तिनम् ।
को ऽयमत्रेति संमन्त्र्य
चुक्षुभुश्शरोषिताः ॥ 102
वज्रमाहारयत्तस्य
बाहुमुद्यम्य वृत्रहा ।
स बाहुरुद्यतस्तस्य
तथैव समतिष्ठत ॥ 103
स्तम्भितः शिशुरूपेण
देवदेवेन लीलया ।
वज्रं क्षेप्तुं न शक्नोति
बाहुं चालयितुं तदा ॥ 104
भगश्च नेत्रे विकृते

चकार स्फुटिते च ते ॥ 109cd

शिरः प्रकम्पयन्विष्णुश्
चक्रमुद्यम्य संस्थितः ॥ 36cd
तस्यापि शिरसो बालः
स्थिरत्वं प्रचकार ह ।
चक्रं क्षेप्तुं न शशाक
बाहुंश्चालयितुं न च ॥ 37

29d तस्या] तथा MS^{Nep} 31a उद्यमस्] 102b तस्य] तस्या conj.; °वर्तिनम्] °वर्तिनः
उत्थितस् MS^{Bodl}, उद्यतस् MS^{Nep} 37d Venk. Ed. 109c भगश्च] भगस्य conj.
बाहुंश्] बाहुं MS^{Nep}

Mahābhārata 7.173

Skandapurāṇa 13 (B^{pur} 36.27–54)

पूषा दन्तान्दशन्दन्तैः
 शर्वमवैक्षत मोहितः ।
 तस्यापि दशनाः पेतुर्
 दृष्टमात्रस्य शम्भुना ॥ 37

यमस्य स्तम्भितो दण्डस्
 तेजो वह्नेः शशेः प्रभा ।
 बलं वायोस्तथान्येषां

न संबुबुधिरे चैनं
 देवास्तं भुवनेश्वरम् ।
 सप्रजापतयः सर्वे
 बालार्कसदृशप्रभम् ॥ 61

तस्मिन्सर्वदिवौकसाम् ।

बलं तेजश्च योगं च
 तथैवास्तम्भयद्विभुः ॥ 38
 अथ तेषु स्थितेष्वेव
 मन्युमत्सु सुरेषु तु । 39ab

61d] तस्मिन्मुमुहुरीश्वरे ॥ MBh 13.145.32d

37cd] A reads these *pādas* after 38 38ef]
 B^{pur} reads these *pādas* after 35 39b तु]
 SE, च R B^{pur} After 39ab R inserts:
 नारायणस्तु शर्वं तं ज्ञात्वा तिष्ठति लीलया ।

Liṅgapurāṇa 1.102

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

पूषा दन्तान्दशन्दन्तैर्
बालमैक्षत मोहितः ।
तस्यापि दशनाः पेतुर्
दृष्टमात्रस्य शम्भुना ॥ 38

वह्निः शक्तिं तथा क्षेप्तुं
न शशाक तथास्थितः ॥ 32cd
यमो ऽपि दण्डं खड्गं च
निर्ऋतिर्मुनिपुंगवाः ।
वरुणो नागपाशं च
ध्वजयष्टिं समीरणः ॥ 33
सोमो गदां धनेशश्च
दण्डं दण्डभृतां वरः ।
ईशानश्च तथा शूलं
तीव्रमुद्यम्य संस्थितः ॥ 34
रुद्राश्च शूलमादित्या
मुशलं वसवस्तथा ।
मुद्गरं स्तम्भिताः सर्वे
देवेनाशु दिवौकसः ॥ 35
स्तम्भिता देवदेवेन
तथान्ये च दिवौकसः । 36ab

बलं तेजश्च योगं च
तथैवास्तम्भयद्विभुः ।
अथ तेषु स्थितेष्वेव
मन्युमत्सु सुरेष्वपि ॥ 39

पूषा दन्तान्दशन्दन्तैर्
बालमैक्षत मोहितः ॥ 108cd
तस्यापि दशनाः पेतुर्
दृष्टमात्रस्य शम्भुना । 109ab

वह्निः शक्तिं तदा क्षेप्तुं
न शशाक तथोत्थितः ।
यमो ऽपि दण्डं खड्गं च
निर्ऋतिस्तं शिशुं प्रति ॥ 105
पाशं च वरुणो राजा
ध्वजयष्टिं समीरणः ।
सोमो गुडं धनेशश्च
गदां सुमहतीं दृढाम् ॥ 106

नानायुधानि चादित्या
मुशलं वसवस्तथा ।
महाघोराणि शस्त्राणि
तारकाद्याश्च दानवाः ॥ 107
स्तम्भिता देवदेवेन
तथान्ये भुवनेषु ये । 108ab

बलं तेजश्च योगांश्च
सर्वेषां जगृहे प्रभुः ।
अथ तेषु स्थितेष्वेव
मन्युमत्सु सुरेष्वपि ॥ 110

38c दशनाः] दशना MS^{Nep} 32c शक्तिं
तथा क्षेप्तुं] क्षेप्तुं तथा शक्तिं MS^{Nep} 39c
एव] एवं MS^{Nep} 39d मन्युमत्सु] स्तम्भितेषु
MS^{Nep}

108b तथान्ये] तथा न Vañg. Ed. 110a
योगांश्च] योगं च conj.

Mahābhārata 7.173

Skandapurāṇa 13 (B^{pur} 36.27–54)

अथाभ्येत्य ततो ब्रह्मा
दृष्ट्वा च स महेश्वरम् ।
अयं श्रेष्ठ इति ज्ञात्वा

ववन्दे तं पितामहः ॥ 62

ब्रह्मा परमसंविग्नो
ध्यानमास्थाय सादरम् ।
बुबुधे देवदेवेशम्
उमोत्सङ्गसमास्थितम् ॥ 39
स बुद्ध्वा परमेशानं
शीघ्रमुत्थाय सादरम् ।
ववन्दे चरणौ शम्भोर्
अस्तुवच्च पितामहः ।
पौराणैः सामसंगीतैः
पुण्याख्यैर्गुह्यनामभिः ॥ 40
अजस्त्वममरो देव
स्रष्टा हर्ता विभुः परः ।
प्रधानपुरुषस्तत्त्वं
ब्रह्म ध्येयं तदक्षयम् ॥ 41
अमृतं परमात्मा च
ईश्वरः कारणं महत् ।
ब्रह्मकृतप्रकृतेः स्रष्टा
सर्वसृक्परमेश्वरः ॥ 42

62ab] ततो ध्यात्वाथ भगवान्ब्रह्मा
तममितौजसम् । MBh 13.145.33ab 62d
पितामहः] उमापतिम् MBh 13.145.33d Af-
ter 62 N inserts (not in MBh 13.145):
ब्रह्मोवाच ।
त्वं यज्ञो भुवनस्यास्य त्वं गतिस्त्वं परायणम् ।
त्वं भवस्त्वं महादेवस्त्वं धाम परमं पदम् ॥ १
त्वया सर्वमिदं व्यासं जगत्स्थावरजङ्गमम् ।
भगवन्भूतभव्येश लोकनाथ जगत्पते ।
प्रसादं कुरु शक्रस्य त्वया क्रोधादितस्य वै ॥ २
व्यास उवाच ।
पद्मयोनेर्वचः श्रुत्वा ततः प्रीतो महेश्वरः ।
प्रसादाभिमुखो भूत्वा चाट्टहासमथाकरोत् ॥ ३

39c ब्रह्मा] अहं B^{pur} 39e बुबुधे] बुद्धवान्
B^{pur} 39f °त्सङ्ग°] SAE, °त्सङ्गे RB^{pur}
40a स बुद्ध्वा] ज्ञात्वाहं B^{pur} 40c चरणौ]
चरणं B^{pur} 40d] स्तुतवांस्तमहं द्विजाः B^{pur}
40e पौराणैः] पुराणैः B^{pur} 40f गुह्य°]
SAB^{pur}, देव° R 41a अमरो] अजरो B^{pur}
देव] S₂, देवः RAE B^{pur} 41b हर्ता विभुः
परः] विभुः परापरम् B^{pur} 41c] प्रधानं
पुरुषो यस्त्वम् B^{pur} 41d तदक्षयम्] S,
यदक्षरम् R, तदाक्षरम् AE, तदक्षरम् B^{pur} 42c
°कृत्] S₂ E, °सृक् RB^{pur} 42d °सृक्]
°कृत् B^{pur} परमेश्वरः] प्रकृतेः परः B^{pur}
After 42 RAE insert:
न च त्वं देवदेवेश शक्नो ज्ञातुं दिवौकसेः ।
मुनिभिश्चापि मोक्षज्ञैर्ज्ञातुं देव न शक्यसे ॥ १
अप्रमेयो महादेव वर्तसे त्वं स्वलीलया ।
महासर्गे महाकल्पे त्वमेकस्तिष्ठसे प्रभो ॥ २

Līṅgapurāṇa 1.102

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

ब्रह्मा परमसंविग्नो
 ध्यानमास्थाय शंकरम् ।
 बुबुधे देवमीशानम्
 उमोत्सङ्गे तमास्थितम् ॥ 40
 स बुद्धा देवमीशानं
 शीघ्रमुत्थाय विस्मितः ।
 ववन्दे चरणौ शम्भोर्
 अस्तुवच्च पितामहः ॥ 41
 पुराणैः सामसंगीतैः
 पुण्याख्यैर्गुह्यनामभिः ।
 स्रष्टा त्वं सर्वलोकानां
 प्रकृतेश्च प्रवर्त्तकः ॥ 42
 बुद्धिस्त्वं सर्वलोकानाम्
 अहंकारस्त्वमीश्वरः ।
 भूतानामिन्द्रियाणां च
 त्वमेवेश प्रवर्त्तकः ॥ 43
 तवाहं दक्षिणाद्धस्तात्
 सृष्टः पूर्वं पुरातनः ।
 वामहस्तान्महाबाहो
 देवो नारायणः प्रभुः ॥ 44

ब्रह्मा ध्यानमुपाश्रित्य
 बुबोध हरचेष्टितम् ।
 सो ऽभिगम्य महादेवं

तुष्टाव प्रयतो विधिः ॥ 111
 पौराणैः सामसंगीतैर्
 वैदिकैर्गुह्यनामभिः । 112ab

40d] उमोत्सङ्गसमास्थितं MS^{BodI} Ad
 40 Gaṇeśa Nātu comments: परमसंविग्नो
 ब्रह्मा ध्यानमास्थाय उमोत्सङ्गे आस्थितं तम्
 ईशानं सर्वनियन्तारं शंकरं देवं बुबुधे इत्यन्वयः ॥
 41a स बुद्धा] संबुध्य MS^{Nep} 42b
 पुण्याख्यैर्] पुराणैर् MS^{Nep} Ad 42 Gaṇeśa
 Nātu comments: पुराणैः प्राचीनैः सामसंगीतैः
 सामगायनैरित्यर्थः ॥

इयं च प्रकृतिर्देव
 सदा ते सृष्टिकारणम् ।
 पत्नीरूपं समास्थाय
 जगत्कारणमागता ॥ 43
 नमस्तुभ्यं सदेशान
 देव्याश्चैव सदा नमः ।
 प्रसादात्तव देवेश
 नियोगाच्च मया प्रजाः ॥ 44
 देवाद्यास्त इमे सृष्टा
 मूढास्त्वद्योगमोहिताः ।
 कुरु प्रसादमेतेषां
 यथापूर्वं भवन्त्विमे ॥ 45

तत एवं तदा ब्रह्मा
 विज्ञाप्य परमेश्वरम् ।
 स्तम्भितान्सर्वदेवांस्तान्
 इदमाह महाद्युतिः ॥ 46
 मूढाः स्थ देवताः सर्वे
 नैनं बुध्यथ शंकरम् ।
 देवदेवमिहायातं
 ममैवोत्पत्तिकारणम् ॥ 47
 अयं रुद्रो महादेवः
 शर्वो भीमः कपर्दिमान् ।
 उग्र ईशान आत्मा च
 अजः शंकर एव च ॥ 48

अहमेवं न जानामि चेष्टां तव महेश्वर ।
 कथं विदन्ति त्रिदशा गम्भीरं गहनात्मकम् ॥ ३
 43a देव] SE, देवी RAB^{pur} 44a
 सदेशान] महादेव B^{pur} 44b] देव्या वै
 सहिताय च B^{pur} 45a त इमे] SAE, तु
 इमे R, तु इमाः B^{pur} 45b °मोहिताः]
 मायया B^{pur} 46a तदा ब्रह्मा] अहं विप्रा
 B^{pur} 46d आह महाद्युतिः] चाहं तदोक्तवान्
 B^{pur} 47a मूढाः स्थ] E, मूढा स्थ S₂,
 मूढास्तु A_{1,3}, मूढास्तु A₂, ... ते R, मूढाश्च B^{pur}
 सर्वे] सर्वा B^{pur} 47b बुध्यथ] SRE, बुध्यत
 A B^{pur} 47cd-49cd om. B^{pur}

Līṅgapurāṇa 1.102

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

इयं च प्रकृतिर्देवी
सदा ते सृष्टिकारण ।
पत्नीरूपं समास्थाय
जगत्कारणमागता ॥ 45

नमस्तुभ्यं महादेव
महादेव्यै नमो नमः ।
प्रसादात्तव देवेश
नियोगाच्च मया प्रजाः ॥ 46

देवाद्यास्तु इमाः सृष्टा
मूढास्त्वद्योगमोहिताः ।
कुरु प्रसादमेतेषां
यथापूर्वं भवन्ति मे ॥ 47

सूत उवाच ।
विज्ञाप्यैवं तदा ब्रह्मा
देवदेवं महेश्वरम् ।
संस्तम्भितांस्तदा तेन
भगवानाह पयजः ॥ 48

मूढाः स्थ देवताः सर्वा
नैव बुध्यत शंकरम् ।
देवदेवमिहायातं
सर्वदेवनमस्कृतम् ॥ 49

नमस्तुभ्यं महादेव
महादेव्यै नमो नमः ॥ 112cd
प्रसादात्तव बुद्धादिर्
जगदेतत्प्रवर्तते ।

मूढाश्च देवताः सर्वा
नैनं बुध्यत शंकरम् ॥ 113
महादेवमिहायातं
सर्वदेवनमस्कृतम् । 114ab

45b °कारण] °कारणम् MS^{Nep} 47a
इमाः] मया MS^{Nep} 47d इमे]
इते MS^{Nep} 48c संस्तम्भितांस्तदा]
स्तम्भितांस्तदा MS^{Nep} 49a मूढाः स्थ]
मूढास्थ Venk. Ed., मूढास्तु MS^{Nep} Ad 49ab
Gaṇeśa Nāṭu comments: सर्वा देवताः शंकरं
न बुध्यतातो यूयं मूढास्थ अविवेकेन वर्तमाना
इत्यर्थः ॥ 49c °आयातं] °आयान्तं
Vaṅg. Ed.

113a बुद्धादिर्] बुद्धादि conj. 113cd]
The editor remarks: किमिति प्रश्ने –
अध्याहर्तव्यम्. The reading of these two *pādas*
is no doubt a corruption of SP 47ab, but due to
the fact that the change in those addressed (from
Śiva to the gods) has been omitted in the M^{kh}
(i.e. the equivalent of SP 46) a 'correct' reading
would make a rather awkward transition.

देवदेवः परं धाम
ईशः पशुपतिः पतिः ।
जगत्स्रष्टा जगद्धर्ता
जगत्संस्थितिकारणम् ॥ 49
गच्छध्वं शरणं शीघ्रम्
एतमेवामरेश्वराः ।

सार्धं मयैव देवेशं
परमात्मानमव्ययम् ॥ 50

ततस्ते स्तम्भिताः सर्वे
तथैव त्रिदिवौकसः ।
प्रणेमुर्मनसा शर्वं
भावशुद्धेन चेतसा ॥ 51

50b एतम्] RAE, एवम् S₂, एनम् B^{pur}
एवामरेश्वराः] एव महेश्वरम् B^{pur} After
50 R and A insert:
ब्रह्मणो वचनं श्रुत्वा देवो नारायणस्तदा ।
प्रहस्य विबुधान्सर्वान्बोधयामास लोकपः ।
एवमेव न संदेहो यथाह पद्मसम्भवः ॥ १
पूर्वसर्गे ऽपि विबुधाः सृष्टायोज्य च मां शिवः ।
बहुरूपेण कार्येण जगद्वाप्य व्यवस्थितः ॥ २
पातालं दिवमाकाशमेको व्याप्य व्यवस्थितः ।
तस्मात्सर्वात्मना भूत्वा गच्छध्वं शरणं हरम् ॥ ३
51c शर्वं] SE B^{pur}, सर्वं R, सर्वे A_{1,2}, सर्वे A₃

गच्छध्वं शरणं शीघ्रं
 देवाः शक्रपुरोगमाः ।
 सनारायणकाः सर्वे
 मुनिभिः शंकरं प्रभुम् ॥ 50
 सार्धं मयेव देवेशं
 परमात्मानमीश्वरम् ।
 अनया हैमवत्या च
 प्रकृत्या सह सत्तमम् ॥ 51
 तत्र ते स्तम्भितास्तेन
 तथैव सुरसत्तमाः ।
 प्रणेमुर्मनसा सर्वे
 सनारायणकाः प्रभुम् ॥ 52

गच्छध्वं शरणं शीघ्रं
 यदि जीवितुमिच्छत ॥ 114cd

ततः संभ्रमसंपन्नास्

तुष्टुवुः प्रणताः सुराः ।
 नमो नमो महादेव
 पाहि पाहि जगत्पते ॥ 115
 दुराचारान्भवानस्मान्
 आत्मद्रोहपरायणान् ।
 अहो पश्यत नो मौढ्यं
 जानन्तस्तव भाविनीम् ॥ 116
 भार्यामुमां महादेवीं
 तथाप्यत्र समागताः । 117ab

50b शक्र°] शक्र° Veñk. Ed. 51b
 परमात्मानम्] परत्मानम् Veñk. Ed. (hypo-
 metrical) 51d सत्तमम्] उत्तमं MS^{Nep}

ततः प्रसादयामासुर्
 उमां रुद्रं च ते सुराः ।
 अभवच्च पुनर्बाहुर्
 यथाप्रकृतिं वज्रिणः ॥ 63
 तेषां प्रसन्नो भगवान्
 सपत्नीको वृषध्वजः ।
 देवानां त्रिदशश्रेष्ठो
 दक्षयज्ञविनाशनः ॥ 64

अथ तेषां प्रसन्नो ऽभूद्
 देवदेवो महेश्वरः ।
 यथापूर्वं चकाराशु
 देवतानां तनूस्तदा ॥ 52

63b उमां] तदा Ś K₁₋₃ D_{1,4-8} 63cd]
 बभूव स तदा बाहुर्बलहन्तुर्यथा पुरा ॥ MBh
 13.145.34cd

Līṅgapurāṇa 1.102

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

अथ तेषां प्रसन्नो ऽभूद्
 देवदेवस्त्रियंबकः ।
 यथापूर्वं चकाराशु
 वचनाद्ब्रह्मणः प्रभुः ॥ 53

युक्तमेतद्यदस्माकं
 राज्यं गृह्येत चासुरैः ॥ 117cd
 येषामेवंविधा बुद्धिर्
 अस्माभिः किं कृतं त्विदम् ।
 अथ वा नो न दोषो ऽस्ति
 पशवो हि वयं यतः ॥ 118
 त्वयैव पतिना सर्वे
 प्रेरिताः कुर्महे विभो ।
 ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां
 पतिस्त्वं परमेश्वरः ॥ 119
 भ्रामयस्यस्त्रिलं विश्वं
 यन्त्रारूढं स्वमायया ।
 येन विभ्रामिता मूढाः
 समायाताः स्वयंवरम् ॥ 120
 तस्मै पशूनां पतये
 नमस्तुभ्यं प्रसीद नः ।
 अथ तेषां प्रसन्नो ऽभूद्
 देवदेवस्त्रियंबकः ॥ 121
 यथापूर्वं चकारैतान्
 संस्तवाद्ब्रह्मणः प्रभुः ।

तारकप्रमुखा दैत्याः
 संकुद्धास्तत्र प्रोचिरे ॥ 122

53b] देवदेवो महेश्वरः MS^{Bodl}

120ab] cf. Bhag. Gītā 18.61cd 120c
 विभ्रामिता] विभ्रंशिता इ० पा० (Venk. Ed.)

तत एवं प्रवृत्ते तु
 सर्वदेवनिवारणे ।
 वपुष्कार देवेशस्
 त्र्यक्षं परममद्भुतम् ।
 तेजसा यस्य देवास्ते

चक्षुरप्रार्थयन्विभुम् ॥ 53

53e यस्य] SRE, तस्य A B^{pur} देवास्ते]
 ते ध्वस्ताश् B^{pur} 53f] चक्षुः सर्वे न्यमीलयन्
 B^{pur}

Līṅgapurāṇa 1.102

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

तत एव प्रसन्ने तु
 सर्वदेवनिवारणम् ।
 वपुश्चकार देवेशः
 त्र्यक्षं परममद्भुतम् ॥ 54
 तेजसा तस्य देवास्ते
 सेन्द्रचन्द्रदिवाकराः ।
 सन्नह्यकाः ससाध्याश्च
 सनारायणकास्तथा ॥ 55
 सयमाश्च सरुद्राश्च
 चक्षुरप्रार्थयन्विभुम् । 56ab

को ऽयमङ्ग महादेवो
 न मन्यामो वयं च तम् ।
 ततः प्रहस्य बालो ऽसौ
 हुंकारं लीलया व्यधात् ॥ 123
 हुंकारेणैव ते दैत्याः
 स्वमेव नगरं गताः ।
 विस्मृतं सकलं तेषां
 स्वयंवरमुखं च तत् ॥ 124
 महादेवप्रभावेन
 दैत्यानां घोरकर्मणाम् ।
 एवं यस्य प्रभावो हि
 देवदैत्येषु फाल्गुन ॥ 125
 कथमीश्वरवाक्यार्थस्
 तस्मादन्यत्र मुच्यते ।
 असंशयं विमूढास्ते
 पञ्चात्तापः पुरा महान् ॥ 126
 ईश्वरं भुवनस्यास्य
 ये भजन्ते न त्र्यम्बकम् ।
 ततः संस्तूयमानः स
 सुरैः पद्मभुवादिभिः ॥ 127
 वपुश्चकार देवेशस्
 त्र्यम्बकः परमाद्भुतम् ।
 तेजसा तस्य देवास्ते
 सेन्द्रचन्द्रदिवाकराः ॥ 128
 सन्नह्यकाः ससाध्याश्च
 वसुविंशे च देवताः ।
 सयमाश्च सरुद्राश्च
 चक्षुरप्रार्थयन्प्रभुम् ॥ 129

54a प्रसन्ने] प्रयत्ने MS^{Nep} Ad 54 Gaṇeśa
 Nātu comments: सर्वदेवनिवारणं सर्वदेवैरपि
 द्रष्टुमशक्यमित्यर्थः । Ad 55 Gaṇeśa Nātu com-
 ments: तस्य शिवस्य तेजसा प्रतिहतदृष्टय इति
 शेषः । ते पूर्वोक्तसर्वे देवाः विभुं सर्वव्यापकं
 शिवं चक्षुर्दिव्यदृष्टिमप्रार्थयन्प्रार्थितवन्त इत्यग्नि-
 मेणान्वयः । 56b] चक्षुश्च { चक्षुश्चा° MS^{PC?} }
 प्रार्थयन् विभोः MS^{Nep}

तेभ्यः परमकं चक्षुः
स्ववपुर्दृष्टिशक्तिमत् ।
प्रादात्परमदेवेशः

अपश्यंस्ते तदा प्रभुम् ॥ 54

ते दृष्ट्वा परमेशानं
तृतीयेक्षणधारिणम् ।

ब्रह्माद्या नेमिरे तूर्णं
सर्वं एव सुरेश्वराः ॥ 55

तस्य देवी तदा दृष्ट्वा
समक्षं त्रिदिवौकसाम् ।
पादयोः स्थापयामास
स्रग्मालाममितद्युतेः ॥ 56

54a परमकं] स परमम् B^{pur} 54c
°देवेशः] °देवेशम् B^{pur} 54d प्रभुम्] विभुम्
B^{pur} 55c] शक्राद्या नेमिरे देवाः 56a
दृष्ट्वा] SA₁₋₃ E B^{pur}, दृष्ट्वा A₄, (दृष्ट्वा) R

Līṅgapurāṇa 1.102

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

तेभ्यश्च परमं चक्षुः
सर्वदृष्टौ च शक्तिमत् ॥ 56
ददावम्बापतिः शर्वो
भवान्याश्चाचलस्य च ।
लब्ध्वा चक्षुस्तदा देवा
इन्द्रविष्णुपुरोगमाः ॥ 57
सब्रह्मकाः सशक्राश्च
तमपश्यन्महेश्वरम् । 58ab

मुनयश्च महादेवं
गणेशाः शिवसंमताः ।
ससर्जुः पुष्पवृष्टिं च
खेचराः सिद्धचारणाः ॥ 59
देवदुन्दुभयो नेदुर्
तुष्टुवुर्मुनयः प्रभुम् ।
जगुर्गन्धर्वमुख्याश्च
ननृतुश्चाप्सरोगणाः ॥ 60
मुमुहुर्गणपाः सर्वे
मुमोदाम्बा च पार्वती । 61ab

ब्रह्माद्या नेमिरे तूर्णं
भवानी च गिरीश्वरः ॥ 58cd

तस्य देवी तदा दृष्टा
समक्षं त्रिदिवौकसाम् ॥ 61cd
पादयोः स्थापयामास
मालां दिव्यां सुगन्धिनीम् । 62ab

तेभ्यः परतमं चक्षुः
स्ववपुर्दृष्टमुत्तमम् ।
ददावम्बापतिः शर्वो
भवान्याश्चाचलस्य च ॥ 130
लब्ध्वा रुद्रप्रसादेन
दिव्यं चक्षुरनुत्तमम् ।
सब्रह्मकास्तदा देवास्
तमपश्यन्महेश्वरम् ॥ 131

ततो जगुश्च मुनयः
पुष्पवृष्टिं च खेचराः ।
मुमुचुश्च तदा नेदुर्
देवदुन्दुभयो भृशम् ॥ 132
जगुर्गन्धर्वमुख्याश्च
ननृतुश्चाप्सरोगणाः ।
मुमुहुर्गणपाः सर्वे
मुमोदाम्बा च पार्वती ॥ 133

ब्रह्माद्या मेनिरे पूर्णं
भवानीं च गिरीश्वरम् ।

तस्य देवी ततो दृष्टा
समक्षं त्रिदिवौकसाम् ॥ 134
पादयोः स्थापयामास
मालां दिव्यां सुगन्धिनीम् । 135ab

56cd] तेभ्य परतरं चक्षुः स्ववपुर्दर्शनक्षमा
MS^{Bodl} 56d शक्तिमत्] शक्तिमान्
MS^{Nep} 57b चाचलस्य] च चलस्य
Venk. Ed. Ad 57 Gaṇeśa Nātu comments:
अम्बायाः जगज्जनन्याः प्रकृतेः पतिः पालक
इत्यर्थः । 59b °संमताः] °सत्तमाः MS^{Nep}
61a मुमुहुर्] मुमुहुर् MS^{Nep} 58c नेमिरे]
मेनिरे MS^{Nep} 58d गिरीश्वरः] दिगीश्वराः
MS^{Nep} Ad 61-62ab Gaṇeśa Nātu com-
ments:

Mahābhārata 7.173

Skandapurāṇa 13 (B^{pur} 36.27–54)

साधु साध्विति संप्रोच्य
 देवतास्ते पुनर्विभुम् ।
 सह देव्या नमस्त्रुः
 शिरोभिर्भूतलाश्रितैः ॥ 57

57b देवास्ते] सर्वे देवाः B^{pur}

Līṅgapurāṇa 1.102

Māheśvarakhaṇḍa 2.25

साधु साध्विति संप्रोच्य
तया तत्रैव चार्चितम् ॥ 62cd
सह देव्या नमस्कृः
शिरोभिर्भूतलाश्रितैः ।
सर्वे सब्रह्मका देवाः
सयक्षोरगराक्षसाः ॥ 63

साधु साध्विति संप्रोच्य
तया तं तत्र चर्चितम् ॥ 135cd
सह देव्या नमस्कृः
शिरोभिर्भूतलाश्रितैः ।
सर्वे सब्रह्मका देवा
जयेति च मुदा जगुः ॥ 136

सर्वे शैलादिप्रमुखाः गणपाः मुमुहूर्हव्यग्रा
बभूवुरित्यर्थः । इष्टा देवी त्रिदिवीकसा समक्षं
तस्य शिवस्य पादयोर्दिव्यां सुगन्धिनीं मालां
स्थापयामासेत्यग्निमेणान्वयः । Ad 62cd-
63 Gaṇeśa Nāṭu comments: तया पार्वत्या
अर्चितं मालासमर्पणेन पूजितं शिवं साधु साध्विति
संप्रोच्य तत्रैव तस्मिन्नेव काले देव्या सह
भूतलाश्रितैः शिरोभिः । सर्वे देवाः नमस्कृरिति
पूर्वस्थैरन्वयः ॥ 63b °तलाश्रितैः] °तलं
श्रिताः MS^{Nep}

135d चर्चितम्] चार्चितम् conj. 136d च
मुदा] मुदिताः इ° पा° (Venk. Ed.)